UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,825	08/25/2003	Yoshinao Nagashima	240950US0DIV	1353
22850 7590 05/08/2009 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER	
			GEMBEH, SHIRLEY V	
ALEAANDRIA, VA 22514			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1618	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/08/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/646,825	NAGASHIMA ET AL	
Examiner	Art Unit	

SHIRLEY V. GEMBEH 1618	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 11 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which place application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Rec for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:	es the
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is la no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHI MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on fee (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the da filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. S Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues	for
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
 Interpretable the following rejection(s): Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling. 	
non-allowable claim(s). 7. ⊠ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) □ will not be entered, or b) ⊠ will be entered and an explanation	_
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 20-24. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provid showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	e a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance becaus	
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	e:
13. ☑ Other: The Advisory action mailed on 4/3/09 is vacated.	
/S. V. G./ Examiner, Art Unit 1618 /Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D./ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1649	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Although Applicant has now perfected their priority document with a certified translation of the Japanese patent No. 2000-038260 (which is now entered), Applicant's argument that the rejection is not a proper rejection under 102(e) is not correct, because no proper antecedent basis or conception in context with that described within the instant application exists in this priority document for the following: for example in the certified translated document there is no support for "heat generating source", "ultrasonic waves", "negative ions', "purity having no odor' and "detectable threshold". Therefore priority is not granted back to the date of 2/10/2000, and Surburg remains a proper 102(e) reference, for the reasons made of record, because priority is granted to only 2/9/2001. Note that Applicant's argument that Surburg (US 6,420,334) is at best a rejection under 102(e), and not 102(b) remains correct. Thus the disclosure of the prior-filed Japanese application fails to provide adequate support or enablement in the manner provided by the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 for one or more claims of this application.

The later-filed application must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the prior application (the parent or original nonprovisional application or provisional application). The disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc., 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994).